I. 6. 5.

AN ANSWER TO W. P. his Key About the QUAKERS Light Within AND OATHS.

With an APPENDIX of the SACRAMENTS.

LONDON:
Printed for *R. Wilkin* at the *King's Head* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, 1695.

Imprimatur,

R. Altham, R. P. D.
Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à ſacris.

Jan. 2.
1694.

bl1803757

TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

AN ANSWER TO *W. P.* &c.

WHILST the Bill for excluding the Duke of *York* was agitating, there came forth a Pamphlet, intituled, *A few Words about the Touchy Point of Succession*, teaching the Parliament, that when they had made first an Addreſs to the Duke, to relinquiſh his *Right* to the Crown, if he refuſed, then (but not before) they might, not only juſtly, but *civilly* exclude him by an *Act*. When I had peruſed this Piece, without judging either the Merits of the Cauſe, or the Witneſs of the Argument,

gument, I concluded, that *W. P.* was then a Man principled for the *civil Liberties* of his Country. But I could no otherwiſe reconcile his following Prevarications in the late Reign, than by imputing them to his intemperate Zeal for a boundleſs Liberty of Conſcience. For (according to the Doctrine of King *James* his *Declaration*) he aſſerting in ſundry *Pieces*, Liberty of Conſcience to be *ex Jure Naturali*, has deſtroyed all *Morality*; becauſe he that ſays, that God, in *Nature*, hath given to every Man an inviolable *Right to do Wrong*, confounds Bleſſings and Curſes, Juſtice and Injuſtice, Good and Evil, ſomewhat worſe than *Hobbes* himſelf. For, he only aſſerts a Natural Liberty, but *this* a Divine Privilege to do Wickedneſs, and that *in Nomine Domini.*

But, after all that has been ſaid, the Queſtion about Liberty of Conſcience, is a Queſtion, *de Æquo & Bono*, and not *de Jure*, and therefore may be enlarged or ſtreight-

ned,

ned, as the Good of the Nation requires.

And for *W. P.* I ſhall be glad, if all his publick Undertakings and Performances be great enough, to make a little Piece of his, which he hath lately put forth, be thought, either a conſiderable Book, or the Book of a conſiderable Man; becauſe I like not to give a publick Conſideration to that which is no way conſiderable. The Book I mean, *W. P.* intitules *A Key* (viz.) *to open Quakeriſm to common Underſtandings.* (Edit. 3.) Inſinuating, (for Keys do open by Inſinuation) that Quakeriſm is like a Lock, plain, perhaps, on the Outſide, but full of cunning, crooked Windings within. But then, becauſe it is not ſafe for us to truſt our Lives, Credits, and Eſtates to the bare Word of thoſe Men, whoſe Religion is of ſuch a crooked Condition; had I any Skill in Title-page Cyphers, I ſhould think, it ought not to be called a *Key*, but a *Picklock*, that

opens what it was not made for, as well as what it was. But *W. P.* thinks otherwiſe, and I contend not with one that has been a long Trader in ſuch Wares, for I am ſo ignorant, as to know no other Uſe of Keys, Urim Thummims, Noſegays, Bunches of Myrrh, Cluſters of Grapes, Crumbs of Comfort, and all ſuch Gayeties in the *Titles* of Books, but to turn Bookſellers Shops into Pedlars Stalls; but *W. P.* I ſee, has improved it further, and made it ſerve for a Flouriſh to a Charge of Calumny, which here he brings againſt the Proteſtants of *England.*

So much he can out-ſhoot the Jeſuite in his own Bow: For, whereas the firſt Inventor of this Goodly Device, more gently called it, *miſrepreſented* and *repreſented.* *W. P.* outſtrips him as far as Perverſions and Calumnies are beyond Miſrepreſentations: And then imping the Jeſuite again, he repreſents his own Religion, as like ours as may be,

by

by the new ſoftening Method of *Meaux*. For his Scheme is, firſt, to give the Perverſion of Quakeriſm, as he calls it, and then to repreſent it in equivocal Terms after his own Way, concluding with an Exhortation to all People, to believe in *the Light within*. I ſhall not conſider all his Points, but only *that*, upon which all the reſt do depend, and the laſt, to which the Policy of all tends.

P. 1. 'His firſt pretended Per-'verſion is this. *The Quakers hold,* '*that the Natural Light in the Conſci-*'*ence of every Man in the World, is ſuf-*'*ficient to ſave all that follow it.*

This is no Perverſion, unleſs an Objection made againſt a Tenet, be a Perverſion of a Tenet; which no body thinks beſides *W.P.* For we ſay not, that the Quakers hold, that the Light is therefore ſupernatural, becauſe it is natural; but only that the Quakers believe, that a *Natural* Light is *Supernatural* and Saving: For, we as well know, that the

Quakers believe the *Natural* Light in every Man's Conſcience, to be ſupernatural, as to be ſaving. We miſtake not their meaning, but oppoſe it as an Error; and ſhould admire the Reach of *W. P.* in making this a Perverſion, but that he had no other Way to be revenged of *I. F.* and *T. H.* for baffling him ſorely Twenty Years ago. But *the Light within* (as *W. P.* tells us, page 38.) *being the Root of the Quakers Religion.*

If any thing, they ſay, deſerves Conſideration, this is the Point; and of this they ſay, 1. *That the Light within, is the Rule of the Chriſtian Religion.* 2ly. *That it is God and Chriſt.* 3ly. *That Quakeriſm is taught them by it.* When we have ſhewed the Falſity of every one of theſe, no more is needful to confute them, though more muſt be ſaid to inſtruct them; and then it will be Time enough to refel the chief of thoſe little things *W. P.* offers for them.

But

But becauſe he all along complains, we do little elſe but miſunderſtand them (though I believe it not, yet if it be ſo) I muſt firſt let him know, 'tis their own Fault. The *Light within* is no Scripture Expreſſion, and the Nation had called nothing the Light within, but the Effects of the perceptive Powers of our Minds, that is, our Thoughts, and nothing did they call Chriſt, but Jeſus of *Nazareth*. The Quakers, at their firſt Riſe, ſhifted the meaning of theſe Words, calling Chriſt the Light within, and the Light within Chriſt. And then, what the Nation called Meekneſs, Patience, Silence; they called, *the* Meekneſs, *the* Patience, *the* Silence; accomodating their Language to that ſecret Cypher. What greater Fault then is it in *Engliſh Men*, that they leave not their Native Language, and learn the Quakers myſtical *Cabala* in Matters of Religion? Than that they uſe not, inſtead of the vulgar Tongue, the

Beg-

Beggars Cant in Gypſie Gibberiſh, in things of common Life? Let the Quakers then complain of themſelves, not of us, if they be not underſtood. Since the Foundation of their Religion is laid in counterfeiting the Stamp, and changing the current Value of their Country Language.

But, tho' this is their wretched trifling in ſerious things, yet is it not the worſt Effect of this their ſhuffling Language. For if, ſpeaking in earneſt to *Engliſh Men*, they call the Majeſty of God, by Names appropriated in the Uſe of the whole Nation, to the Meanneſs of Men, as when they ſay, *God is the Light within*, or call the things of Men by Names appropriated to the Majeſty of God, as when they ſay, *the Light within is God*; they viliſie God, and Deifie Men: For their Words do really ſpeak the Senſe of Blaſphemy, whatever they mean by them. A Specimen of this we had in the *Briſtol Hoſanna's*. So dangerous a thing it is for theſe Men

to

to be Speakers. But by this, theſe ſelf-admiring People may ſee, that the Nation hath done more than its Duty to underſtand them, and they leſs than theirs, to be underſtood, ſpeaking to us unintelligibly, on ſet Purpoſe, and clubbing ſecretly together, to conceal their true meaning from us. And yet they muſt have the Praiſe, and we muſt have the Blame of this. But the buſie Men of Leiſure will always abuſe the honeſt Drudgers in Buſineſs. This is the Guilt of their Phraſeology, and by this we know, what is the *Engliſh Light within*, but the Quakers Light within, I ſuppoſe we ſhall find to be nothing but a Name. But let us ſee in the next place, what they make of it. And,

1. They ſay it is the Rule of the Chriſtian Religion. The Chriſtian Religion is nothing but the Service of Jeſus of *Nazareth*, made the Lord and Governour of the Univerſe, for the Salvation of the World. Nothing then can be

the

the Rule of this Religion, but what
1 Cor. 3. 11. discovers to us, that there is one Jesus of *Nazareth*, and that he is Christ the Lord: For this is the Foundation of Christianity, and what is not from this Principle, hath nothing in it of the Christian Religion, be it otherwise right or wrong. But never was any Nation, or any Generation, or any one Man instructed by *that* Light that is in the Conscience of every Man, that there ever was such an one as Jesus of *Nazareth*, much less that he was the *Lord*, and least of all, what he required of his Servants and Attendants: Therefore no Light within, common to all Mankind, can be the Rule of the Christian Religion. So that the notorious Experience of all Men confutes this Pretence of the Quakers, since it was never possible for any Man to learn the least Part of the Christian Religion, by the Light within that is in every Mans Conscience. The *French Kings* have Laws, That no Duel be fought, nor

any

any rob upon the Roads. I never did either hitherto: But that's no Obedience in me, or Exerciſe of Subjection to the *French King*. The *Turks* are to abſtain from Drunkenneſs, and Theft, and to give Alms to the Poor. But they not doing this in Obedience to Jeſus of *Nazareth* as their Lawgiver, it is nothing of Chriſtianity, though in ſome Reſpects it is good. The Quakers may do the ſame things, but if (as they profeſs) their Religion be nothing elſe but what they are led into by *that* Light within which is in the Conſcience of every Man, they have no Chriſtianity.

2. They affirm the Light within is Chriſt, and I ſay, then it is nothing elſe but Jeſus of *Nazareth*. If they make the Light within to be Chriſt, and not Jeſus of *Nazareth*, they make it Antichriſt, and becauſe they worſhip God in this Appearance (as they ſpeak) they are Antichriſtian Idolaters. But I ſhall leave the Reader to judge for himſelf,

Acts 2.36. 4. 12.

P. 104. ſelf, how far the Quakers are guilty of this, when I have given him one Paſſage out of *W. Pen's Chriſtian Quaker*, becauſe he pretends to ſtate this Matter with Critical Exactneſs. But notwithſtanding his pretended Accuracy, I find him ſuch a *Lewd Author*, that I cannot cite one Sentence before it be corrected, both ſtile and Matter. For he makes not *he*, but *it*, the Relative for a Perſon, which is a Stile of his own, and he ſpeaks of a *Holy Perſon*, meaning Jeſus, *that was born at* Nazareth, wherein I ſuppoſe he will confeſs his Infallibility did infallibly deceive him; though elſewhere he could tell us, He that knows not infallibly, knows nothing in Religion. Having thus obliged *W. Pen*, by purging a few Lines of his Book, now they may be ſeen without notorious Falſhood and Nonſenſe; I will venture to produce them. *The Power, Life, and Light which inhabited that Holy Perſon, which (or who) was born at* Bethlehem, *was*,

and

and is chiefly and eminently the Saviour, yet he was instrumentally a Saviour, as prepared for the Work which Christ had then to do in him. By which Words he makes the Light within to be their Christ, and Jesus of *Nazareth*, the chosen prepared Instrument of their Christ: Their Christ then is another than Jesus of *Nazareth*, and therefore is Antichrist. In these Days it seems, there are many Antichrists, the one at *Rome*, that sits on a lofty Throne, the other in *England*, which *W. P.* has put under Lock and Key, to be seen of none but Friends, except one be so prying as to peep through the Key-hole. But since this Mystery has been effectually detected by the great and happy Diligence of Mr. *John Faldo*, and Mr. *Thomas Hicks*: I suppose *W. P.* will be willing to mend this Doctrine, and say, that Jesus of *Nazareth* is the Light within. But then, since that is no Light in Men, that does not discover it self in Men; there is no Joh. 2. 18, 22.

Light

Light *in* Men, *common* to all Mankind, which discovers it self to have become Flesh sixteen Hundred Years ago, or more, and to be that individual Man Jesus Christ. They that go into the barbarous wild Nations, find Men there, whose Light within is the same with their own: who know, giving Food to hungry Men, does them good, and piercing their Hearts with Weapons, does them hurt: And therefore know, whoever bears a good Will to Mankind (as the Maker of Men certainly does) is pleased with feeding, and displeased with stabbing the hungry. But none of these that knew some things were good, and some evil, had the least Apprehension or Suspicion, that the Power whereby they knew this Difference, was Jesus of *Nazareth*, or any Power in Union with that Holy Person, but all thought they had this Knowledge from their *sensitive Observations*, and *Reasonings* from such Observations, as indeed they had:

had: That Light therefore in the Conſcience of every Man, which diſcovers ſome things to be good, and ſome bad, diſcovers not it ſelf to be Jeſus of *Nazareth*. Quakeriſm therefore being built upon that Light, is not the Religion of which Jeſus is the Author. The *Engliſh Light within* is to be met with all the World over, but the Quakers no where, but in their own Imagination.

What then, ſhall all that have not heard of Jeſus be damned? *Anſ.* When the Scripture ſays, that the whole World that believed not in Jeſus, doth lye in Iniquity: If we are not to ſay, they ſhall be damned, we are not to ſay, they ſhall not: But this we are to ſay, that no Man, who does poſitively believe that Jeſus is not the Chriſt, can be ſaved. Nor can any one be ſaved by his Chriſtian Religion, that does not heartily believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt. For he hath no Chriſtian Religion, if he believes it not. 1 Joh 5. 19.

But to accommodate the Anſwer to the Quakers Sentiments, I ſay, God hath indeed given to all Mankind a ſupernatural Light, but then this is not a ſupernatural *Light within*, but for vindicating the Righteouſneſs of God's Judgments, it will come all to one, whether the Light be outward or inward, natural or ſupernatural: And for the Mercy of God towards Sinners, when all is ſaid, that will be as God pleaſes: And ſince no Man uſes the Light he has (be it what it will) ſo well as he might, we can know nothing of that Mercy, but as God hath ſignified his Purpoſe in the Goſpel, which does not promiſe Pardon to any, but believers in Jeſus of *Nazareth*.

3. Notwithſtanding their empty Pretence, the Quakers learn not their own Religion from the Light within, natural or ſupernatural, but from one another. They cannot name one that is a Quaker, who was not made ſo, by hearing them,

or

or reading their Books; ſo that we have certain Matter of Fact to aſſure us, their Religion is not from inward Suggeſtion, but outward Inſtitution, and is learned from others, and not from the Sufficiency of any Principle in themſelves, either of natural or ſupernatural Donation. Beſide, the Frame of Quakeriſm is ſuch, as muſt be erected by Art, Method, and Management, not by Nature or Inſtinct; and the Uniformity they have in their Faith and Worſhip (ſuch as it is) is by Concertation, not by internal Inſtigation: Of which they ſhew themſelves very ſenſible, by their ſeveral Clubs, all ſubordinate to a general Aſſembly, not daring to truſt to the Efficacy of that Unity, which they ſay is in their Principle. Had they all one individual Nature acting them in their Religion (as they profeſs) they would naturally fall into the ſame Courſe.

But seeing, without any Instance to the contrary, they none of them had been of this Mind touching the Divinity of the Light within, nor can they continue in one Mind concerning its Dictates, without conferring Notes together, nothing can be more plain, than that they learn all from one another. By which it is evident, the Quakers Light within is nothing but a vain Pretence.

Object. The Quakers will reply: Nay verily, but we witness the Light within to be Divine.

But I observe no Man regards a Witness that is suborned, or is taught to deliver his Evidence by some leading Questions. Every Man perceives in his Mind, some things are good and some evil, and no Difference indeed appears in Darkness, but in Light; there is a Light within therefore, which every Man experiences in himself. So that every Man is a good Witness of the *English Light* within: But the Quakers always use

uſe Colluſion to procure a Witneſs of their Light within. For thus they tamper with their *Catechumens*, unverſed in ſuch Subtilties. Is there not a Light in every Man's Conſcience? You experience one in your own, and is not God light? And Chriſt light? And is not God within, and Chriſt within? Now this is all very true. But when from hence they infer, God is the Light within, it is a putid Sophiſm, (*a bene diviviſis ad male conjuncta*) even no better, than if I have a Neighbour, that by his Imployment is a Plower of the Ground, and withal is in my Parlour, the Sophiſter ſhould from thence infer, he is a Plower of the Ground in my Parlour. God being Light, and being within Men, proves not that God is a Light within Men. God is Light, and God is within other things as well as Men; is then God a Light within to every Tree, every Beaſt, every Star? If this be abſurd (as it is moſt abſurd) then

God's being Light, and being within, proves but ſophiſtically that God is the Light within: And yet this is the conſtant Method the Quakers uſe to teach their People the Divinity of the Light within; even as they themſelves were all *taught* it. The *Quakers* Witneſs then ſpeaks not their own Senſe, but at beſt their own Sentiments of the Cogency of this trifling Sophiſm; that is, *it* ſpeaks what they feel in their own Minds, to be their Judgment. And indeed, ſince there is a Light in every Man's Mind, plain meaning People, unacquainted with the Tricks of *Legerdemain*, who uſe to judge upon the ſquare, can hardly avoid thinking, that if God be Light, and God be within (as indeed he is) then he is the Light within. Hence it comes to paſs, that whilſt ſuch Scholars as are Maſters of Argumentation, find no Force at all in the *Quakers* reaſoning; poor People ſuſpecting no Deceit, through the Simplicity of

their

their Hearts, are catched by this Juggle of Words. For the Jeſuite himſelf never uſed a purer Piece of Sophiſtry than this is; and yet this is the Sum of all they have to ſay in Confirmation of their Doctrine of the Light. Thus the *Quakers Primmer*, thus this Key of *W. P*'s. and thus all the reſt argue this Point: So that their Teſtimony may perhaps be the Witneſs of honeſt meaning Men, but given in upon *deceptio viſûs*. Like the plain Country-Man's Teſtimony of the ſtrange Feats of Juglers, which he is ſure he ſaw done with theſe Eyes of his. Setting then their Teſtimony aſide, which has no more Validity in it, than there is demonſtration in Sophiſtry, we have the univerſal Experience of a certain matter of Fact, as near to us as can be, that ſince the *Quakers* will have their Light to be common to all Men, and yet not natural; There is no ſuch thing in the Univerſe: That is to ſay, their Light within is nothing at all.

Thus, whilſt theſe People would be
Joh. 1. 8. ſaying, *They have no Sin, they have deceived themſelves, and the Truth is not in them.*

Quakeriſm having now loſt the Lure of a Novelty, is dwindling, and amongſt the Multitudes of the Deſertors in theſe Parts of the Country, not one of many retains any thing of Religion, or even of Quakeriſm it ſelf, except an implacable Hatred for Prieſts, and paying Tithes; for ſo much, the Devil (that has them in his Service) would have them keep ſtill, knowing they cannot do him better Service in any other Poſt. I may not now-a-days therefore, tell Quakers their own Religion is falſe, without telling them what is the Truth, leaſt I ſhould tempt them to leave Quakeriſm for Impiety and Irreligion, and not for the Service of Jeſus Chriſt. I ſhall therefore give a clear, but brief Account of the Light which God gives to Men, for the Direction of their Lives. In order

der to which, I obſerve the Counſels and Thoughts of God, give all the Meaſures of Religion. Now whatever is the Communication of Thoughts, amongſt Celeſtial Spirits, nothing is more certain to us, than that our Minds in Fleſh are immediately privy to no Thoughts of any other Mind, but only of our own. So that in the Nature of the thing, it is poſſible for God to have had Thoughts, and we not know any thing of them: And therefore 'tis neceſſary there be ſomething elſe beſides the Divine Thoughts themſelves, to make us know them. Whatever therefore is a *Notice* to us of any Divine Thought, is not God's Thought it ſelf, nor God himſelf; nor may we worſhip it for our God. Now there are ſeveral things, which being made preſent to our perceptive Powers, become Notices to us of God's Thoughts, of which Thoughts themſelves we have no immediate Perception. Theſe things are ſome natural, ſome

ſu-

pernatural, and of both these, some
Psal. 19. 1. are outward, some inward. *The*
Rom. 1. 20. *Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his Handy-work. And the invisible things of God are clearly seen by the things that are made*; for this visible World is presented to our outward Senses; what so presents it, is outward Light, and gives notice to us of the World's being. Our Sensations are the Light to our Judgments, giving such Notices of the Nature and Operation of things, that we perceive by Argumentation from such sensible Observations, that the things are such as are made by God. And consequently, we must perceive from thence, many of God's Thoughts about the things and their Effects, and so what will please or displease him. These Judgments thus made, are the Light giving notice to our Wills for their Choices. Our Conscience is an inward Sense, perceiving immediately nothing but our own Thoughts;

which

which Thoughts are therefore its Notices; and the Minds perceptive Power presenting these in its self, is the Light in the Conscience of every Man. Now what by Ratiocionation, we can deduce from the condition of these Sensations, or of *the* things perceived, or of our Thoughts themselves, whereby we learn the Thoughts of God, that will be an acquired Light within, for our Direction in Religion. All this taken together, is the Light of Nature, and that Part of it, which is in our selves, is what the *English Nation* calls the Light within.

But besides this, God did heretofore give to some extraordinary Persons, some other Notices of his Thoughts: And because I find the Prophets in their propheſyings, did tell the People of their sins, and of many other things that were past, and of God's Resentments of them. Its plain, though the Notation of the Word *Propheſie* signifies Prediction, yet the Use of it, is of larger

Ex-

Extent, ſignifying any Notice of a Divine Thought, given ſupernaturally, and therefore I ſhall ſpeak of all thoſe extraordinary Notices, under the Stile of Prophetical Inſpirations, when they are given in the Mind of the Prophet. Whilſt theſe prophetical Notices were uſeful (as now they are not) the Method God took, was (when the Remembrance of former Notices was decayed, or Wickedneſs did abound, or an Advance was to be made towards perfecting the publick ſtanding Notices, then) to ſelect out ſome Holy Perſon, and by prophetical Inſpiration, to give an immediate Notice of his Thoughts to his Mind, but never did God give theſe to every Individual Perſon, or beſtow on every Man in the World, good and bad, for *his* ſtated Direction in all his Actions, the Gift of Propheſie. The Author to the *Hebrews* gives this for the ſummary Account of this whole Matter. God, *who in theſe laſt Days, has*

Heb 1.1,2.

ſpoken

ſpoken unto us by his Son, did of old ſpeak to the Fathers the ſundry Parts of Divine Doctrine (πολυμερῶς) *in divers Ways* (*all*) *by the Prophets.* He ſays not by a prophetical Light within the Fathers, and in the Conſcience of every Man. So wide is the Diſtance betwixt the Quakers, and this *Divine Author*'s Senſe.

But we are to remark, that the great uſe of theſe extraordinary Notices, was to compleat the publick ſtanding Notices, for communicating God's Thoughts to the Inhabitants of the Earth, which he gave in Pity to Men's Miſery, over and above the natural Notices, even the Law and the Prophets, which are now a ſtated general Diſcovery of God's Thoughts to this viſible World. And though they were given by ſupernatural Revelation, yet the wiſe Providence of God has ſo ordered that great Important concern of Mankind, that by a Coaleſcence, they are become Part of the Body of

ſen-

ſenſitive Notices in this World, and are more diſtinctly expreſſive, and no leſs evidently demonſtrative of God's Thoughts, than any other Notice from our ſenſitive Obſervations: And becauſe this is not ſo much heeded as I think it deſerves, I ſhall digreſs to obſerve (even for other Uſes beſide what we are upon) that the whole Subſtance and Argument of the Old * Teſtament, is the tranſacting of a Covenant, that all the Nations of the Earth ſhould become the bleſſed Seed of *Abraham*; which came to paſs notoriouſly in the Converſion of the World to the Chriſtian Religion, by every Man's own free Choice, claiming Bleſſedneſs by vertue of the Grant to *Abraham*'s Children. This Book of the Old Teſtament was certainly, viſibly, yea, notoriouſly extant in the World, long before *Auguſtus Cæſar*'s Days, which yet was three or four hundred Years before the Nations of the Earth became the bleſſed Seed of

* Διαθήκη.

of *Abraham*; therefore *this Book thus and then extant*, is ſuch a *Phenomenon* in this World, as could have no Exiſtence, but from an Immenſe Preſcience of the moſt contingent Futurities (ſuch are the voluntary Actions of the Individuals of all the Nations of Men) therefore the certain Exiſtence of this Book in ſuch a manner in the World, proves that there is a God, who alſo intereſts himſelf in the Affairs of Men, and that the Book it ſelf is the Word of God, diſcovering his Thoughts to Men. And hence, by the Way, we ſee the Scripture Evidence relies not upon the Infallibility or Authority of the Church's Sentence, no nor yet upon the Churches Teſtimony, but only upon the Churches Exiſtence. If a *Fratricide* arraigned, pleads he killed not his Brother becauſe his Brother is yet alive, the dead Body of his Brother brought into the Court, is a full Evidence (though no Teſtimony againſt the *Fratricide*: So the being

of

of the Church is all that is requiſite to compleat the Evidence that the Scriptures are the Word of God. And becauſe it is notoriouſly evident, that the Nations of the World became the bleſſed Seed of *Abraham* by beleiving in Jeſus Chriſt, therefore the Chriſtian Religion is from the Author of *that* Book, that is, it is of God, the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Iſrael*. A larger account of theſe things may be neceſſary for other purpoſes, but theſe ſhort Hints, I ſuppoſe, may ſuffice to let us ſee, that before the Covenant was made good in the Converſion of the Nations, the Miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Followers, were the great Evidence ſupporting the Faith of Believers, but ſince the Kingdoms of the Earth became Chriſtian, there are none needful, this being an open publick viſible Demonſtration of the Trnth of Scripture Teſtimony. For the prime Uſe of Miracles was to confirm Verbal Declarations of God's

God's Thoughts, and give Validity to them. But when the Verbal Notices (as in this Caſe) are verified, they become themſelves miraculous, and areſelf-evident. For Predictions of future Contingencies is as great a Miracle as any other, if they be made ſenſibly evident ſo to be. The being of the *Catholick Church* is the ſenſible Evidence of theſe Predictions: Wherefore the ſtanding publick ſupernatural Notices being thus compleated, the principal uſe of Propheſie, and its Seal is ceaſed, which the Event alſo confirmeth; whilſt a true Piece of Architecture is framing, it may need a Center or the like forreign Support, but when the Arch is finiſhed, its own Form bears up its Weight, and the Center is removed, and it would be a Diſparagement to the Artiſt to ſet a Prop to it afterwards. They therefore that are not content with the ſtanding Light of God's Eſtabliſhment, but will be waiting or hearkening for a new Light

within or without, tempt God to give them up to Deluſions, as the ſad Experience of all Ages teſtifies. There were Multitudes at the End of our Civil Wars, gazing for a new Light. No leſs than Ten new Lights were ſet up in Three Years: The deluded themſelves ſaw Nine of them were Deluſions, and ſober Men that judg'd by God's ſtanding Notices, ſaw them all wrong, and many of them blaſphemous and wicked. With the Reaſon of this Diſcourſe agrees St. *Paul*, aſſuring us that *all were not Prophets, nor Workers of Miracles. And that Prophecies, and Tongues, and Miracles* (as we ſee in Fact) *ſhould ceaſe and paſs away.* Not but that God may ſtill reveal ſome things to ſome particular Perſons by prophetical Inſpiration; but he does it not to any as a Prophet, whom others are bound to hear, under Guilt of Sin againſt God, eſpecially if God's Seal of Miracles be not annext to it: But as theſe prophetical Notices were never

1 Cor. 12. 29. 13. 8.

never general to every Man; no, nor yet ſtated (except perhaps in the Theocracy by *Urim* and *Thummim*) ſo now there is no common Uſe of them: For the grand Propheſie, to which all theſe did ſerve is by the ſtanding Notices, ſufficiently clear and certain to us all, (*viz.*) That whoever repents and believes in the Lord Jeſus, ſhall be raiſed from the Dead in another World, unto everlaſting Life, and they that do not, unto everlaſting Condemnation. And I ſee not how any Propheſie can diſcover this more clearly than it is already in the Scripture: For if Men will not believe *Moſes* and the Prophets in this, neither will they believe, though one roſe from the Dead: For ſuch Unbelief is not from any want of Light, but from a perverſe wanton Willfulneſs, which it comports not with Divine Majeſty to humour in its Capricio's.

Laſtly, We muſt further obſerve, that as the ſtanding Notices of God's

Thoughts, whether in the World's Frame, or in the Scripture, do now, ſo likewiſe heretofore the extraordinary Notices, by prophetical Inſpirations (when they were) did all differ from the Illumination of Men's Minds, by the gracious Operation of the Holy Ghoſt: So that the being of this, is no Proof of the Preſence of thoſe. For the Difference is very manifeſt betwixt the Illuſtration of an Object preſenting it to the Senſe, and the Illumination of the Faculty. If a blind Man be in a light Room, and a Man of ſound Sight in a dark Room, neither of them perceives the things about him; but by a Light brought into one Room, the ſound ſighted Man would ſee; but ſhould the Light be doubled to the other, the blind Man would be no leſs in Darkneſs; for he wanted not Light, but a Faculty to ſee. Sight muſt be given to him (if at all) not by Light, but by Medicine. The Illumination of our Minds is by a ſa-

native,

native, reſtorative, or quickening Vertue and Operation of the Spirit, but not by a Divine Light. The Sun's Vertue generates all Life, and its Faculties in Bodies, but none by its Light: For all Life is bred in Teguments either of Shells or Matrices purpoſely excluding the Light. 'Tis obſervable, that the holy Spirit, to whoſe Office it belongs to enlighten our Minds, and clear the Eyes of our Underſtandings, is no where in Scripture called Light; for it is the Form and Nature of Light to diſcover it ſelf, and preſent other things to the Sight, which we experience the Spirit does not in this Work. I affirm nothing now of prophetical Inſpiration, but this I may ſay, that neither is the illuminating, or renewing, or regenerating, or any other Divine Inſpiration, immediately perceptible to any Senſe, inward or outward in humane Nature; and if ſo, 'tis certain, none of theſe can be a Light within to us. There is a Divine Inſpiration, that

made our Souls, and an Inſpiration that upholds them in Life: A Divine Inſpiration gives Strength to our Bodies; a Divine Inſpiration gives the Power of Senſation, of thinking, and willing: But we have no Senſe whereby we can feel the Divine *Agency* making or upholding our Life, Motions, or Operations, either of our Souls or Bodies. *Though it is certain in him we live, and move, and have our Being.* Acts 17.28. The Effects of theſe Inſpirations we feel, for we perceive that we live, think, will, and move. Now theſe Effects are not God; but from the Quality of theſe Effects, and by other ſtanding Notices compared together: We know by reaſoning, but not by Senſe or Conſcience, that God is the Cauſe of them. In like manner, God's Inſpirations make us religiouſly to know, fear, and love him, but the Agency of the Divine Inſpiration in theſe, we cannot feel, but know them to be Effects of a divine Inſpiration by

Arguments

Arguments drawn from the Condition of theſe Thoughts themſelves, compared with other ſtanding Notices in Nature and Scripture conjunct. This therefore is a Concluſion, not known by inward Senſation, but by Opinion or Science, as the Caſe is.

The Country-man never felt the divine Inſpiration, by which he is taught to order his Ground and his Crop; but by the publick Notices in the World, he knows the Art he has is moſt excellent, moſt uſeful, good and profitable unto Men. From whence he can conclude, that he has this Skill by the Inſpiration of the Almighty, the Fountain of all good things; and the Scripture aſſures him, that if he has ſuch Skill, it is becauſe *his God inſtructs him in his Buſineſs*. Proportionably our Saviour teaches us, the regenerating Operation of the Holy Ghoſt is like *the Wind that bloweth where it liſteth, and we hear the Sound thereof* (the Effect on other things being our

Iſa. 28. 28, 29.

Joh. 3. 8.

Notice of it) *but know not whence it comes, nor whither it goes.* The Concurrence of many Cauſes being requiſite to produce Faith, the Quakers confound theſe Inſpirations with the Light, and attribute the Efficiency of one Cauſe to another, which muſt needs pervert all ſound Judgment of things, and make them ſpeak Inconſiſtences: As when *W. P.* ſays, Man cannot *be a Light to himſelf.* As if the Denial of the Divinity of the Light within implyed any ſuch thing. *And Man has only a Capacity to ſee,* as if the Defect was in God's Works in Nature, and in the Scripture, and not in Man's ſeeing Faculty. Now ſuch Expreſſions ſhew his Apprehenſions are much perverted about theſe things.

P. 2.

Having now ſhewed, I hope, diſtinctly enough, and with as much Brevity as was fit, what Light God hath given to Men, and proved the Quakers Light within, to be nothing at all; I ſhall now obſerve what

what *W. P.* thinks of it: He expreſſes his Senſe, by taking a Word out of one Text, and another out of a ſecond, and another Word out of a third, and joyning theſe with ſeveral other Words out of a fourth, makes up a Sentence; which not reaching the Quakers Doctrine, he is forced to debauch the Scripture with a piece taken out of G. *Fox*, *his Myſtery of the great Whore*, and thus delivers his Opinion. *Chriſt, who is the Word, that was with* God, *and was* God, (and is ſo for ever) *hath enlightened every Man that cometh into the World, with his own Light.* Now, *with his own Light* is not Scripture, but the Quakers *Apochrypha*; which ſufficiently convinces us, *W. P.* could find no Scripture that teaches the Quakers Faith. For here is no Word that intimates the Light to be a Light within: Only his Addition of *with his own Light*, looks a little that way: Let us therefore ſtate this Matter more clearly. As the illuminating Spirit is no where call-

ed

ed Light in the Scripture, ſo neither in this Text nor any other, is God or Chriſt, who are called Light, ever called a *Light within*, either in expreſs or equivalent Terms. The Quakers have reaſon to deny then, that the Scripture is the Rule of their Religion. When the Scripture ſpeaks of Light, though it be the Lightening flaſhing in the Heavens (they have ſo heated their Heads with thinking, that) they imagine it means within the Conſcience of every Man. We meet with no Scripture, that I remember, which ſpeaks any thing of any Light within, except three Texts, which are plainly referred to one of the two ſorts of Light which I mentioned before. Firſt, that of *Solomon*: *The Spirit of Man is the Candle of the Lord, ſearching all the inward Parts of the Belly.* That is, the Spirit of Man which God hath made, hath in its Nature a Conſciouſneſs of all his Thoughts, Purpoſes, and Counſels within him.

Pſal. 97. 4. 77. 18.

Prov. 20. 27.

In

In the ſecond Chriſt ſays, *If the Light that is in thee be Darkneſs, how great is that Darkneſs? Take heed that the Light in thee be not Darkneſs.* If the Light in us here mentioned, was the Light that is God, the Suppoſal, that it might poſſibly be Darkneſs, would be a blaſphemous ſuppoſition. In the third, the Apoſtle tells us, that *God who commanded the Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs, had ſhined in their Hearts, to give the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God, in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt*; where the Apoſtle uſes not the Term of Light within, only teaches, as *God* did put all the Light, that diſcovers all the Differences of things in this viſible World, into the Stars and Luminaries: So all the Light that diſcovers to Men the things of the other World, he had ſettled in the Apoſtles and their fellow Labourers, making *them to be the Light of the World*, being the holy Perſons, which God ordained, to compleat the

Mat. 6. 22. Luke 11. 35.

2 Cor. 4. 6.

Mat. 5. 14.

the publick Notices of the things concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, that is the ſtanding Rule of Religion; which being done, Propheſies ceaſed, as *St. Paul* foretold they ſhould. And it imports not the Argument in hand, whether the Apoſtle here means the firſt Diſcovery, which God gave the Apoſtles of theſe things, which was by Jeſus his Information, when he was with them on Earth; or their infallible Remembrance of theſe things, by the extraordinary miraculous Operation of the Holy Ghoſt deſcending upon them viſibly, which was given them to bring the things to their Remembrance, which Jeſus had told them. Seeing all are not Apoſtles, or Prophets, or Workers of Miracles, as they were: And therefore this is not the Quakers Light within, that is common to all Men, Believers and Infidels, which have no Communion in ſuch things as theſe.

Theſe Places then (which are all I can think of) concerning an internal Light, make nothing for the Quakers. But becauſe *W. P.* elſewhere, and other Quakers do ſo inſolently and vainly glory of *St. John*'s Teſtimony (though there is no Tittle of it ſignifying the Light to be within) I ſhall explain this Text, by giving a ſhort Account of the Matter ſpoken of in this weighty Portion of Scripture ; to ſhew what *is the true Light, which enlighteneth every Man coming into the World.* Joh. 1. 9. The divine Life, not only in the Father, but in the Son, is it ſelf Life, and hath a Power in it cauſing all other Life. This Power gives Life, either by original Donation, or by Reſtoration and Renovation: But this Power in the divine Life of the Son, exerts its Efficacy with reſpect to loſt Man : Firſt, by original Donation of Life to that particular Manhood, with which it became one Perſon ; and by that Life, invigorated by the divine Life

of

of the Son in Perſonal Union with it, renews the loſt Life of Mankind to ſuch Perſons as he himſelf wills. Now not to trouble our ſelves with unknown Decrees, it is certain, he does effectually will this Life, which is eternal Life, to all thoſe that believe in Jeſus, but not to them that deny him. This Life, thus giving, and this Life thus given, *St. John* conſiders here in Union, and this Life conjunctly. conſidered, being diſcovered to Men, *is the Light of Men, and the Light of Life.* For if there be no Life for Men but this Mortal Life, we muſt direct our Actions for an earthly ſenſual Happineſs: But if there be an eternal Life hereafter, that muſt be the End, ſhewing us how to order the Counſels and Studies of our Lives, when it is diſcovered to us. But then this Life not being preſented to Men by an immediate Diſcovery in every Man's Conſcience, it is not the Quakers Light within, and the Scripture no where ſays, the Life is

1 Joh. 5. 11, 12. 20. Joh. 1. 4. c. 8. 12.

ſo

ſo preſented; and Experience aſſures us, it is not. But on the contrary, this Life thus to be given, was diſcovered in ſome meaſure, by the divine Diſpoſals of humane Affairs in all Ages, and ſo far *ſhined in the Darkneſs* of Heatheniſm, and more in the ſhades or ſhadows of the *Moſaical Inſtitution* to the *Jews*, but moſt clearly and fully in the Goſpel; ſo that *God* in this Diſpenſation, *is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all*; for nothing can be more fully diſcovered, than it is now diſcovered, that God *gives unto us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son, for he is the true God and eternal Life.* Chriſt came on purpoſe to ſhew himſelf to Men. And therefore he aſſures us, that *he came a Light into the World, a Light to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the Glory* (or refulgent Light) *to the People Iſrael And Galilee that ſat before much in Darkneſs and Shade, had this Light ſprung up, and ſaw this great Light*; when Jeſus came amongſt

Joh. 1. 5.

1 Joh. 1. 5.

1 Joh. 5. 11, 20.

Joh. 12. 46. 35. 36. ch. 9. 5.

Luk. 2. 32. Mat. 4. 16.

amongst them. For Jesus, by his publick Discourses, and particular Instructions to his Disciples, the open Actions of his Life, his Death, Resurrection, and visible giving of
2 Tim. 1. 10. the Holy Ghost, hath *brought this Life, even Immortality to light.* Insomuch, that it is not more clear, that God gave the Earth to the Children of Men, or the Land of *Canaan* to the Children of *Israel*, than Jesus did then make it express and evident, that he gives Christians everlasting Life. He also took care, that this Life should be discovered
Mat. 28. 19. *to all Nations, to every Creature* under Heaven, by appointed Heraulds, who were to
Mark 16. 15. *be Witnesses of* all those things which he charged
Act. 1. 8. them with, *in Jerusalem, Samaria, and unto the uttermost Parts of the Earth*; sending them *forth into all the World* for that purpose: And lest by any humane Mistake, they should fail in delivering the Message truly, he gave them an infallible Assistance by his Spirit, that they

they might certainly *remember all things that he had ſaid to them.* Which Charge they ſo effectually executed, that *like the Sun, their Sound went forth into all the World, and their Words to the Ends of the Earth.* And their ſucceſs in their Meſſage *was famed throughout all the World*, and their Report of *this Life came into all the World, and was made known to all Nations, and was heard of by all the Gentiles*, and was preached (or publiſhed) *to every Creature under Heaven*, and therefore *to every Man that cometh into the World.* The Scripture aſſures us, that Chriſt did thus diſcover the Life, and therefore being himſelf the Author of this Life, and the Author of this Diſcovery, *He is the true Light, which enlighteneth every Man coming into the World, which John Baptiſt was not.* Neither is this Life known to any one, but by the means of this Report, which Jeſus himſelf ſpread throughout the Earth. How then is the Quakers Light univerſal,

Joh. 14. 26. c. 16. 13, 14, 15.

Rom. 10. 18.

Rom. 1. 8. 16. 26.

Col. 1. 6.

2 Tim. 4. 17.

Col. 1. 23.

Joh. 1. 9.

Joh. 1. 8.

that never discovered this Life in Jesus to any one throughout the succeeding Ages. Now this Report made by Jesus, is properly the Gospel, and not the Life reported; and this same Report is that which is properly the Word of God, and is so called most frequently, in the New Testament. With what Decency could *W. P.* and others so haughtily upbraid their Reprovers with this Text? Which even taking the Words as *W. P.* construes them, makes nothing for them, but is fully against them, if the Expressions be considered more exactly. For when Christ is said to enlighten every Man coming into the World, should we refer *the coming into the World*, to every Man, it is plainly a Redundance of speech, adding nothing more to the sense, than what was expressed by saying, *every Man*. But besides (which is to be more observed) a Man's being *born into the World*, is no where in Scripture called, *his coming into the World*,

World, and perhaps it is inconvenient ſo to phraſe it; becauſe coming into any Place in common Acceptation, connotes coming from another Place; but a Man that is born, comes not from any Place, becauſe he was really no where before. But coming into the World, is peculiarly adapted to Chriſt's Caſe, *who came out from the Father, and came into the World*; and it was ſo appropriated to him, that [*he that cometh*] was the Periphraſis, or known Characteriſtick, of the *Meſſias* in thoſe Days. If then we will judge by the true Rule for interpreting Scripture, we muſt, according to theſe Reaſons, thus expound this Text. Chriſt coming into the World, ſhewing himſelf to *Iſrael*, declaring the Life to come, which he is the Author of, and making this good News publick throughout the World, is the true Light, enlightening every Man. Now this Text thus conſtrued, carries in it the very ſenſe which we oppoſe to the

Quakers Opinion of the Light within. If the Flashes of the Quakers opinionative Light, had not so dazled their Eyes, that they cannot see the real Light, they might readily perceive upon the whole, the Scripture is their avowed Adversary, which they use to revile by the stile of the Letter, the dead Letter, the Letter that *killeth*, and *W. P.* thinks it consistent with the great Honour that is due to the Scripture, to compare it with the *Roman Legends*. But *W. P.* hopes to make this Place look more favourably towards them, by adding a piece of the Quakers Apocrypha. For he tells us, the Word enlightens every Man *by its own Light*. But what does he mean by *his own Light?* does he mean in the most proper sense, the Light whereby God is Light. This Light is the Deity it self, and then the Soul of every Man will be deified thereby. For as Oyl, inflamed by the Substance of Flame, is no longer the substance of

P. 1.

of Oyl, but Flame. And a Stick fired with the ſubſtance of Fire, becomes Fire, and is Wood no longer. And every Part of the Matter of the Heavens, that is lighted with the ſubſtance of the Sun, is the ſolar ſubſtance, and not the common *Æther*. So every Mind lighted by the Subſtance of the Deity, is it ſelf the Deity. This then would ſpeak the Quakers Godded with God, and Chriſted with Chriſt, in the ranting Cant of their Predeceſſors, but in a worſe ſenſe than thoſe Libertines intended. Beſides, did God enlighten Men, not by what he does, but by what he is, the Illumination would not be of Grace, but of natural Neceſſity, reſulting from the very being of God, and the being of Man. But if becauſe there is none other, from which God can borrow Light, *W. P.* ſhould therefore think, it muſt be God's own Light, wherewith he enlightens Men. It cannot be denied, but God does enlighten

Men, with what is *his own Light* in this Sense, as he enlightens and waters the Earth with *his own* Sun, and with *his own* Rain; for this argues no more, than that Men are enlightened, not by what God is, but by what God does, and consequently God is the Cause of the Light wherewith every Man is enlightened. And then the Light is an Effect, and not God himself. Now this is contradictory to the Quakers Sense, who say, the light wherewith every Man is enlightened, is God, and is the Word. *W. P's* Addition to this Scripture therefore teaches either to blaspheme God, and deny his Grace, or else to contradict the Quakers Doctrin; and we thank him for this Liberty, and desire no more, and will use it as reason requires.

For, by this we learn the Scripture and the Quakers Apocrypha, Truth and Error will no more incorporate, than Iron and Clay; and therefore, though *W. P.* had the Arm of a *Cyclops*, and the Art of *Vulcan*; he could not weild them to-

together, and forge a Key out of them. I venture to use this odd Expression, to try if I could hit the singularity of this Man's Humour; for after he has told the World, that he is skilled in ten or twelve Languages, and shewed himself the redoubted Champion in the Quakers Host (who, as often as he entred the Lists with a single Combatant, or twenty at a time, whole Nations, whole Ages, alway came off with the greatest Triumphs.) As if these magnificent Titles were not sufficient to give him an Idea of himself, glorious and tickling enough, he must now hang up a Key on the sign-post, to make a publick Ostentation of some miraculous Skill above all Men in the Lock-smiths Trade. For did even Man before imagine that Quakerism could be opened by a Key to every common Understanding? 'Tis point blank repugnant to their very Principle. That methinks is more agreeable to their Pretensions, which honest *Isaac Pennington* so of-

ten repeats that maſtering things of Religion, with the Underſtanding, is a falſe Birth, from the ſpirit of Whoredom, and committing the ſin of Fornication. It is enough for any Man living, to make Quakeriſm (like a well contriv'd Romance) to be conſiſtent with it ſelf. But to reconcile it to the common Senſe of Mankind, is not a Task for a Mortal to undertake, be he never ſo daring an Enterprizer. But after all, I would ask *W. P.* whether he can believe (I mean in earneſt) that he hath any whit opened this fundamental Point of the Quakers Religion. When he hath done nothing towards it, but told us it is by *God's own Light*, which is an Expreſſion of ſuch a meditated Temperament, that it determinately ſignifies, neither a natural, or ſupernatural, a divine or humane, an inward or outward Light, but all Indifferently: Which is the Cunning of Concealing and Diſguiſing, not of opening and explaining ones

mean-

meaning. If therefore he would no longer abuſe the World, he muſt mend the Book, or alter the Title Page; for as the Book is now, upon the whole it appears, it ſhould be intitled not a *little Key for opening, but a little Eſſay for confounding the underſtanding of God and Man.* P. 3.

From explaining, he proceeds to proving: And I ſee not, but his opening and arguing Faculty are much of the ſame ſize; for having ſaid before, the Light is the *Word*, he ſaw the thredbare Sophiſm was imperfect, until he had proved the Light to be within every Man. But he is much perplext with it, not knowing whether he had beſt prove, God is wholly or only partly in eve- Man. And before he can reſolve whether is the right, he falls to proving both; right or wrong. His Jo. 1. 43.
Profs are theſe. *He that is with you* 17, 18, 20.
ſhall be in you: I will not leave you Col. 1. 26.
comfortleſs, I will come unto you. I 2 Cor. 13.
in them, and they in me. Chriſt in 5.
us the Hope of Glory. Unleſs Chriſt Gal. 4. 19.

be

be in you, ye are Reprobates. Little Children, of whom I travel in Birth again, until Christ be formed in you: To which I Answer; Christ says not here, that any Man except his Disciples, *shall have him in them*, and signifies that they themselves at that time *had not him in them*. If this Place proves any Point, it would be that Christ was then in no Man; for the same reason *I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you*, is of the same force. *I in them, and they in me.* By this Place it is evident, Christ is in none but those that are in him, therefore
2 Cor. 5. 17. Christ is in no ungodly Men, because they *are not new Creatures as every one is*, that is in Christ. For the same reason, *Christ in you the the Hope of Glory*, is an Argument
2 Tim. 3. 8. against *W. P. unless Christ be in you, you are Reprobates.* This proves no Reprobates (that is, *Men of perverse Minds concerning the Truth*) have Christ in them. How then is Christ in every Man if he be in none of these? *My little Children, of whom*

1

I travel in Birth again, until Christ be formed in you. The Persons here spoken to then had not Christ in them. Thus every Proof he brings contradicts his own Conclusion. He should have added the Parallel Place, *If Christ be in you, the Body is dead because of Sin, but the Spirit is Life, because of Righteousness.* Rom. 8. 10. And he need not to have said any more to confute his own Principle, and assure us, that Christ is not in every one, but only in Believers; and in these indeed Christ is on several Accounts, on none of which can he be in Unbelievers; but neither in Believers is Christ a Light within. So far is *W. P.* from gaining his Point, For whereas on this Head he had two things to prove; he disproves the one, and ne'er thinks to speak to the other. If it be replyed (as they use to do) *None but Believers have Christ in Union, but all others have Christ in them.* I say, if there was one Place in the Bible that says, Christ is in all others, the Quakers would

would have juſt Cauſe to charge their Key-maker with Prevarication (betraying their Cauſe which he undertook to defend) bringing only ſuch Texts as are againſt them, and paſſing over thoſe that make for them. But no ſuch Text being to be found, he muſt be excuſed for not producing them. Alas, their Principle is repugnant to the common Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind. No wonder then the Scripture no where ſays, that God or Chriſt is the Light in every Man's Conſcience. Indeed, there is nothing can be ſaid for it, but that pitiful Sophiſm which *W. P.* hath all along endeavoured to diſguiſe with equivocal Expreſſions, and that's all. And yet the audacious Man curſes and damns all Men for Antichriſts, that are not catched with ſuch a ſilly Fallacy as this; but ſlight it, *ſtiffly denying Chriſt to be the Light in every Man's Conſcience.* And he makes this Denyal no leſs Antichriſtian, than murdering the Son of God out

P. 4.

of

of mere Malice. Ah, raſh Judge! that paſſes ſuch a dreadful Sentence againſt all Mankind upon ſuch a ſlender Evidence as this. Theſe I hope are all the Inſtructions, Reproofs, and Rebukes which I owe the Quakers at this Time upon this Head. But I owe them a great many good Wiſhes, and hearty Deſires. *If God peradventure would give them Repentance, to the acknowledging of the Truth, and that they may recover themſelves out of the Snare of the Devil*, which by being both *Neophytes* and *Teachers* they are faln into. But theſe, if I forget not my Duty, I ſhall pay them elſewhere.

2 Tim. 2. 25, 26. 1 Tim. 3. 6.

Of Oaths.

TO their Scruple about Oaths, I ſhall only hint theſe few Thoughts, becauſe true ſpeaking is not only a Part of Honeſty, but Religion, therefore not only Honeſty,

neſty, but Religion is ingaged with its full Force and Intereſts to ſupport it, unleſs Religion may not ſupport it ſelf: But if a Man engages all his Religion for the Support of a true Speech, he takes an Oath. But I ſhall not inſiſt upon the Nature of an Oath, but conſider its Place in the political ſtate of God's Kingdom. I muſt confeſs, I cannot underſtand how there can be a Conſtitution againſt all ſwearing univerſally in any Kingdom humane or divine, where all Ranks of the Kingdom ſwear without any Reprehenſion from the Laws, as it is here: For God ſwears, and commands ſwearing by his Name. And Chriſt anſwers upon Adjuration before a Judge (which is the Way of ſwearing in all Evidence in our *Engliſh Courts*) and the Angels ſwear, and the Apoſtles ſwear, and all Chriſtians take ſacramental Oaths. *W. P.* elſewhere hopes to evade all this, by ſaying, ſwearing is only to be allowed for want of Faith, either in him

Mat. 26. 63, 64.

him that ſwears, or in him to whom the Oath is ſworn. But this he muſt retract on many Accounts, particularly becauſe God the Father ſwears to the Son; *Heb.* 7. 21. where there is infinite Faithfulneſs on both ſides: And it is to be obſerved, that this Oath is ſo ſacred in this Conſtitution, that the whole Power of the Kingdom of the Meſſias doth ſtand upon its Validity. I would therefore ask *W. P.* whether an Order forbidding all Oaths in this Kingdom, would not be void, *ipſo Jure*, as being contrary to the fundamental Conſtitution of the Kingdom, and ſubverting the legiſlative Power it ſelf. All particular Laws therefore muſt be interpreted ſo, as to leave place for an Oath in this Eſtabliſhment. Eſpecially,

1. When the Expreſſion, whereby the particular Law is ſuppoſed to forbid all Oaths, does frequently, in the Law-books, ſignifie no more than falſe Oaths, or ſwearing otherwiſe amiſs; as may be ſeen by comparing

Lev. 5. 1.
Eccl. 9. 2.
Zech. 5. 3.
Hoſea 4. 2.
Jer. 23. 10.

paring *Mat.* 5. 34. with the Texts in the Margin.

Ezek. 21. 23, *&c.*

2ly. When the ſuppoſed Prohibition is part of a Diſcourſe to inſtruct us, that the Righteouſneſs of this Kingdom does *exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees*, who amongſt other bad Precepts of Life, did teach particularly, that there were ſeveral ſorts of Oaths, which had no Sacredneſs in them, but that Men might make and violate many Oaths without any Impiety.

Mat. 5.20.

Mat. 23.16, 17, 18.

Mat. 5.34. Lev. 19.12. Exod. 20.7.

3ly. When this ſuppoſed Prohibition of all ſwearing is introduced with a Preface which joyns two Scriptures together, which are ſet far aſunder in the Law-books, and by being ſo joyned, may ſeem to give the *Phariſees* ſome Pretence for making ſome ſorts of Oaths profane; for *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but ſhalt perform to the Lord thy Oaths*, being brought together and ſet as Oppoſites, *do in* Appearance argue, that we ſhall not forſwear our ſelves,

ſelves, unleſs when we ſwear by the Lord, we neglect to perform our Oaths, and therefore are left at liberty to violate all other ſorts of Oaths: Except ſome things accidentally happen to be ſo near to the Lord, that it would be undecent to treat them rudely. Now this will find Work for Caſuiſts, to define what are the Degrees of Nearneſs, that we may underſtand, what a Man may, without Guilt, forſwear himſelf by, and what not. Now theſe Definitions the *Phariſees* made ſo very abſurdly, that our Saviour rebukes them ſeverely for their Folly therein. Mat. 23. 19, 20, 21.

4ly. When Chriſt divides this Prohibition into its Parts; he does not divide it as againſt ſwearing in all Caſes, but ſets the Branches of his Diſtribution directly to oppoſe this corrupt Gloſs of the *Phariſees*; for he does not ſay, ye have heard, that it hath been ſaid, *Ye ſhall ſwear in Truth, in Righteouſneſs, and in Judgment.* But I ſay unto you, Mat. 5. 35, 36. Jer. 4. 2.

ſwear not at all, neither for the ſake of Truth, or Righteouſneſs, or Judgment. Nor does he ſay, ye have heard, that it hath been ſaid,
Deut. 6. 13. *Thou ſhalt ſwear by the Name of the*
Joſ. 23. 7. *Lord thy God*, and ſhalt *not ſwear by the Name of the Gods of the Nations*
Iſa. 65. 16. *round about thee*: Or, *Thou ſhalt*
Zeph. 1. 5. *ſwear by the God of Truth, and ſhalt not ſwear by* Malchom. But I ſay unto you, ſwear not at all, neither by the true God, nor a falſe one. For then Chriſt had forbidden the expreſs Uſe of Religion for the Maintenance of Juſtice, Peace, and Charity. No, nor yet does Chriſt ſay, ye ſhall neither ſwear by God or Creatures: For ſo far as concerned ſwearing by God, the *Phariſees* Doctrine of Oaths was ſound; and therefore it is obſervable, Chriſt takes no notice of ſwearing by God, nor does he prohibit that expreſly, as he would have done above all, if he had here intended to forbid the ſacred Uſe of all Oaths; ſeeing this was the moſt ſolemn, and the moſt known

known, and the moſt uſual Oath of all, and the Meaſure of all others. But what does Chriſt ſay? Why, *I ſay unto you, ſwear not at all, neither by Heaven, nor by the Earth, or* Jeruſalem, *or thy Head.* Directly contrary to ſwearing by the Temple, the Altar, the Heavens, which the *Phariſees* taught to be lawful to do, and not be bound by ſuch kind of Oaths. Matt. 23. 16, *&c.*

5. When Chriſt gives the Reaſon of the Prohibition, he takes it not from the Unholineſs or accurſed State of the things ſworn by, which made them uncapable of any good Uſe in the moſt holy Conſtitution of his Kingdom, as in reaſon he would have done, if he had intended totally to forbid ſuch a Uſe of them; as we ſee St. *Paul* forbids the religious Uſe of Idols and Idolothytes, becauſe he ſays the one was Devils, and the other was the Meat of the Devil's Table in that ſeparated State; and ſo ſtrict Laws are made againſt ſwearing by any other

Gods, becauſe they were Devils, or uſed as Devils, and were accurſed as ſuch, and therefore might not be medled with, unleſs we would be accurſed with them. But here, Chriſt on the contrary renders the Reaſon of his Prohibition from the Sacredneſs of the things ſworn by, and the extraordinary Holineſs of their State. The one is *the Throne*, the other is *the Footſtool*, and the third *the City of the great King*. Which are Arguments againſt the profane Violation, but not againſt the ſacred and holy Uſe of ſuch things. For is there any thing too holy for Chriſtian Men? Or does God think his Name, or the Power of his Kingdom too ſacred for us to uſe for the better Maintenance and Security of Truth, Righteouſneſs, and Judgment in the Earth? Or is not rather making religious ſwearing by his Name, to be a Chriſtian Duty, a plain Confeſſion that the Peace, and good Eſtate of Mankind cannot be preſerved, but by the ſacred

Matt. 5. 36, 37.

cred uſe of the Majeſty of his Name, and the holy Eſtabliſhment of his Kingdom? Which Confeſſion is the peculiar Honour that God delights in from us Men. Some things indeed were ſo holy, that the *Jews* might not approach them, *becauſe the Way into the Holieſt of all was not then made open:* But that Way is open now, and therefore the Holyneſs of any thing is no Argument, why the Chriſtians ſhould not make a religious Uſe of it for the Service of Charity. Since they are *ſat down with Chriſt in Heavenly Places, and have their πολίτευμα in Heaven.* However, Oaths cannot be too holy for Chriſtians to uſe holily, when even the Jews were holy enough for them. If Chriſt had thus argued againſt the Uſe of all Oaths, he had in reaſon argued againſt the Holineſs of his own Kingdom. And, whereas our Saviour adds; *Neither ſhalt thou ſwear by thy Head, becauſe thou canſt not make one Hair white or black.* This is a further Confirmati-

Heb. 9.8.

Eph. 2. 6.
Phil. 3.20.

on of what we ſay. For though by God's Ordinance in *Nature*, our Wills have more immediately a Power over the Parts of our Body, than any thing elſe: Yet we are to obſerve, that God retains the abſolute Diſpoſal even of this, according to his own Will; ſo that not our Wills, but *his* diſpoſes even of the very Colour of our Hairs, which are therefore ſacred, becauſe the right of the Diſpoſal of them remains in God. And therefore our Hair, and much more our Head, may not be devoted to ſerve a Lye, becauſe this is againſt the holy and juſt Will of God, in whoſe Right theſe things remain.

Laſtly, and eſpecially, when it is very evident, that the affirmative Precept which Chriſt here puts in Oppoſition to not ſwearing at all, is not contrary to ſwearing, but to ſwearing falſly: And therefore falſe ſwearing is the thing here forbidden; for thus Chriſt concludes this Diſcourſe, *Swear not at all, but let*

your

your Communication be yea yea, and nay nay. Some weak Cuſtoms of the Quakers would tempt us to believe, that they thought Chriſt here intended to teach us in our Speech, to ſay *Yea*, and not *Ai* or *Yes*; and to ſay *Nay*, rather than *No* or *Not*: But this is mimicking Chriſt's Laws, and not expounding or obeying them. Much leſs does Chriſt here teach, that when we have once ſaid *Nay*, or *Yea*, we muſt repeat them over again. For what ſignifies this, but incumbring our Diſcourſe: But the plain Deſign of this Precept is, that whatever we aſſert by Affirmation or Negation, either by way of Aſſeveration, Proteſtation, or Oath in our Communication, our Yea muſt really not be Nay, but Yea; and our Nay not be in Reality Yea, but Nay. That is, our Speech muſt agree with the Truth and Reality of things which we ſpeak of. Now, ſince Chriſt puts this oppoſite to the ſwearing he here forbids, that ſwearing only is the ſwearing which here

Chriſt forbids, which is contrary to Falſhood, that is Perjury directly, and profane ſwearing by Conſequence, as taking off the awful Reverence of Oaths, whoſe Sacredneſs is deſigned for the great Support of Truth in the Earth. This Sacredneſs the *Phariſees* did plainly invalidate, for if their Yea might be Nay, when it was affirmed by any kind of Oath, the Sacredneſs of an Oath is ſo far aboliſhed. Our Saviour therefore to reſtore to this Bond upon the Soul its full Strength, entred this Precept into his Laws, that our Righteouſneſs might in this reſpect, exceed the Righteouſneſs of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*. Accordingly St. *Paul* (as if he then had this Diſcourſe of Chriſt in his Thoughts) after he had vehemently *diſclaimed the Uſe of Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay,* (that is of Yea's and Nay's promiſcuouſly) for the aſcertaining this, he makes Oath, ſaying, *As God is true, our Word towards you, was not Yea and Nay*; and again, *It was not yea*

Heb. 6. 16.

2 Cor. 1. 17, 18, 19. 30.

yea and nay, but in Christ (or by Christ) *it was Yea.* Where we see, how an Oath serves to make our Yea to be Yea indeed. In a Word, the Design of our Saviour in this Law, was not to exterminate all Oaths out of God's Kingdom administred by the Gospel (which is *the Word of the Oath, since the Law*) but to redintegrate the Sacredness of an Oath, establishing the Inviolableness of all Oaths whatsoever; so that whoever henceforward shall use that thing which is under the Bond of an Oath, as a profane thing, that is, at the Disposal of a Man's Freedom of Choice, and not of God's Will, shall himself be excluded, and *not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Heb. 7.28.

But I foresee, that some others besides Quakers, may think, that the Interpretation of Christ's Law to such a Sense (*that Perjury is the thing directly forbidden, and the Light common and profane Use of Oaths by Consequence*) may be apt to give Occasion to the Continuance or Increase

creaſe of the cuſtomary Ungodly ſwearing that is amongſt us. I muſt therefore here declare, I ſhould be heartily ſorry, if that ſhould prove ſo. But that will not be imputable to this Interpretation, but to the Superfluity of Naughtineſs in this Impious Generation. For that an Irreligious Uſe of Oaths ſhould ſpring from the Doctrine of the moſt ſacred, tremendous, and religious Uſe of Oaths, is contrary to the Nature of the thing. And to ſpeak more cloſe to the Caſe. If all the plain repeated Laws and Threats contained in God's Word againſt blaſpheming, reproaching, defying, affronting, reviling, contemning, contumelious uſing, profaning, deriding, ludicrous ſcoffing, and even inſulting and glorying over the Majeſty of God Almighty, are not enough to deter a Man's Conſcience from the common ſwearing of the Age (which includes in it all theſe horrid Impieties) I can hardly think he will be diverted from it, by that other Expoſition of this Text,

which

which is attended with ſo many obvious Objections againſt it, as I have here briefly ſuggeſted, beſides ſeveral others. But if this be the true Senſe, as by all the Circumſtances of this Law it is, I dare not reſpect God's Perſon, or believe that he would be bleſſed alone, or envies any good means to his Church, that may further Juſtice, Peace, or Charity amongſt Men. And if I was to diſſemble or lye for any one, I had rather to do it for the worſt of Men, than for the God of Heaven. To conclude therefore, the Quakers execrating all Oaths out of Chriſt's Kingdom, ſeem to me, to curſe what Chriſt has bleſſed. If then they take up Opinions contrary to the Laws of their Country, and the Belief of Chriſt's Church, whereby they knowingly diſable themſelves to ſerve the Nation, and the Intereſts of Truth and Juſtice, whatever *W. P.* ſays, this is no ones *Fault but their own.* Unleſs they will charge it upon their Light within, but that being P. 33.

ing

ing nothing but a Creature of their own Making, will not excuſe them neither: And being it is now thrown down to the Ground, it may even lye there, for I ſuppoſe *W. P.* finding there is nothing in it beſides a mere Fallacy (be it from the Quakers Simplicity, or the Jeſuites Subtilty) will not think it worth while to cement, and paint it, and ſet it up again for the poor Peoples Adorations, but will rather be very well content, that the Exhortation he gives us to believe in the Light within, ſhall hence forward paſs for nothing but Words of Courſe. For when no Scripture ſays a Word about it, and no Senſe in Humane Nature hath the leaſt Notice of it, why ſhould any Man believe it, or be concerned for a mere new nothing.

An

An APPENDIX *about the* SACRAMENTS.

PLighting our Faith in the Name of God, to *adhere* to the Conduct of one againſt avowed Enemies, is that kind of Oath which we call a Sacrament. This being done by Chriſtians to Jeſus Chriſt (againſt all the Powers and Abettors of Sin) in Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper; theſe are therefore two Sacraments, whereby we are liſted, as it were, under Chriſt, and engaged on his ſide againſt Sin and all its Forces. I ſay Sacraments, for if we might not call things ſpoken of in Scripture, by ſuch Names as are in uſe for ſuch things amongſt us, becauſe ſuch Names are not in the Scripture, it would be a Sin to tranſlate the Scripture into any vulgar Tongue. Such Advantage *W. P.* gives the Papiſts againſt the Proteſtants, by his weak

Remark

Remark about the Difference betwixt the Church's and the Scripture Language. (P. 23.) I shall briefly consider what *W. P.* offers in particular against this sort of Oaths, for justifying the Quakers Practice. And first,

Of Baptism.

BAptism is a Rite of Admission into the Family of God, making Persons Citizens of Heaven, and free of the Kingdom of the Messias. It consists of an outward and visible Sign, and an inward spiritual Grace. These are the two Parts of the same Baptism, but not two Baptisms. And the Union of these two effected by the Divine Power of this Kingdom, makes these two one Baptism. For neither is the visible Part alone, or the invisible Part by it self, Baptism, but both in Union by the Divine Appointment. And this is the one, and the only Christian Baptism. There
Eph. 4. 5. are several other things in Scripture

ture called metaphorically, Baptiſm, becauſe of ſome Reſemblance they have with this. Thus the *Iſraelites* were *baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, which was ſomething like the Chriſtian Baptiſm; for the Cloud and the Sea were as the outward viſible Sign, and God's gracious admitting them into the State of his peculiar People therewith, was the inward ſpiritual Grace. So Chriſt's Sufferings, and the Apoſtles, were ſtiled the Baptiſms they *were to be baptized withall*. Where the Sufferings were the outward ſign, and the Happineſs of *the Spirit of Glory, that reſts upon them that ſuffer* like Chriſtians, was the inward ſpiritual Grace. And the viſible Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, for its Reſemblance with the common Chriſtian Baptiſm, is called, *Baptizing with the Holy Ghoſt*. Where the viſible Appearance of the Dove, of the cloven, fiery, and ſundry Tongues (as at Chriſt's coming out of *Jordan*, at *Pentecoſt*, and *Cornelius* his Houſe) were the outward viſible

1 Cor. 10. 2.

Luk. 12. 50.

Mat. 10. 39.

1 Pet. 4. 13, 14, 16.

Act. 11. 15, 16.

Acts 1. 5. Mat. 3. 11. Joh. 1. 33. Mat. 3. 16.

Acts 2. 3, 4. c. 10. 46. c. 11. 15.

visible signs; and the powerful Presence of the Holy Ghost with these Persons, was the inward spiritual Grace: But these really were not Baptisms, though so denominated from the Similitude which they had, with that which was the common notorious publick Baptism, and was the known Rite of admitting Men into the Kingdom of the Messias, and by the Appointment of God, was to be done by the washing of Water. For *John* admitted Men into the Faith of the Messias; that is, into the State of Subjects, owing and acknowledging Allegiance to Christ, and by Vertue of the Grant of Repentance unto Remission of Sins, in Water he baptized with the Baptism of Repentance into the Kingdom of Heaven. And Christ owns this Grant and Admission valid in his Kingdom, and that they were legally instated in the Rights of his Kingdom whom *John* baptized: This being done by a publick authorized Herauld of his Kingdom. What *John* there-

Acts 19.4.
ch. 1. 22.
Mark. 1.4.
Act. 13.24.
Mat. 11.12.
Luke 7. 29, 30.
Mat. 21. 31, 32.
John. 1. 31, 33.

therefore did, was according to an Ordinance and Law in the Kingdom of the Messias: And Christ never rescinded this Ordinance, or any other, which *John*, as the Herauld of his Kingdom did promulge. But on the contrary, declares, Mat. 3.15. that being baptized with Water, was a Part of Righteousness, which it could not be, unless there was a Law of the Kingdom for it; because Righteousness in any Kingdom, is Conformity to the Law of the Kingdom. And though absolute Kings are not properly subject to their own Laws, yet it may become them to do the things commanded on several *Accounts*; whereupon he himself would be baptized with Water, because *it became him to fulfill all Righteousness*. After he had been himself baptized, he baptized many more with Water than *John* Joh. 3.25, did, by his particular Orders given to his 26. Disciples, whilst he was present with them, who were his appointed Officers for this Service: And before he left them, he gave them a perpetual standing Commission to baptize with Water; and af- Mat. 28.18 ter he was ascended into Heaven, they did not misunderstand his Command, and yet in his Name we find them baptizing with Water. And therefore, that was Acts 2.38, the Baptism they had in Commission 41. from him, which Commission was to 8. 12, 13, 38.

Acts 18. 18. c. 9. 18. c. 10. 47, 48. c. 11. 16, 17.

continue *to the End of the World.* And (as appears by St. *Peter's* Diſcourſe) when the Apoſtles did baptize with Water, they accounted themſelves obliged by God to do ſo: And, that it was not in their Power to refuſe it, unleſs they would reſiſt God. And ſince there is no reſiſting God, but by violating his Ordinances: It's plain, they accounted refuſing to baptize with Water, was the Violation of a Law given them by God. So that they judged their Commiſſion to baptize all Nations, did indiſpenſibly bind them to baptize with Water, acknowledging no Authority whatſoever could diſcharge them from this Obligation, and forbid Water in the Baptiſm which they were to baptize withall. And yet, any one might have forbad it, if it had not been commanded of God. It is likewiſe worth obſerving, that this was done at their firſt beginning to baptize all *Nations.* And it was done againſt *Jewiſh Prejudices*, and not as *W. P.* ſays, in condeſcending Compliance with them.

Act. 11. 2, 3. P. 24.

Act. 11. 17. c. 10. 47.

Nor was the giving of the Holy Ghoſt before, pleaded againſt the Uſe of Water in the Baptiſm which St. *Peter* baptized with; but on the contrary, was alledged as an Argument to prove the Neceſſity of uſing Baptiſm by Water. *Peter's* Goſpel in this contradicting *W. P's*

P. 26.

Plea

Plea for the Quakers: For he thought not the Gift of the Holy Ghost superseded the Use of Water, or made Ordinances too mean a Dispensation for spiritual Men, *or was* given as a Privilege for Disobedience, but as a Qualification for the better Observance of Christ's Commands: For Christ having joyned the outward Sign of Water, and the inward Grace of his Spirit, by an Establishment in his Kingdom: St. *Peter* knew no Man may put them asunder. And therefore, he that being baptized with Water, does *ponere Obicem* against the Efficacy of the inward Grace; and likewise, he who by the Holy Ghost, saying, Jesus is the Christ, does refuse to be baptized with Water, do both violate a Constitution in Christ's Kingdom. I can but hint a few things of many. Acts 8. 13. 18, 19. 1 Cor. 12. 3.

Let us now see upon what Inducements *W. P.* rejects Water-Baptism, as he calls it. As (1.) because *Protestants are against Figures and Shadows.* (2ly.) *No Signs are of the Nature of the Gospel, Christ, the Substance being come.* (3.) *Water Baptism was* John's, *not Christ's.* (4.) *Jesus never used it.* (5.) *It is no Part of* Paul's *Commission.*

1. *Protestants are against Figures and Shadows.* But Baptism and the Lord's Supper being no Figures nor Shadows, all Protestants are much for them; unless P. 24.

Quakers are to be accounted Proteſtants, that diſown all the Proteſtant Churches, and are owned by none.

P. 24. 2ly. *W. P. is againſt all Signs*, as well as all Figures, *becauſe they ſubvert the Goſpel, and evacuate Chriſt's coming.* It ſeems then, *W. P*'s Goſpel is an inſignificant thing, not having the leaſt Sign of any Goodneſs in it. We Mortals can neither think, or ſpeak, or work without the Uſe of Signs; therefore a Goſpel without Signs can be of no Uſe to us. More particularly, there could be no viſible Church, no Communion amongſt Chriſtians, no publick Worſhip, no Exerciſe of Charity, Juſtice, or Sobriety; no receiving of a Prophet, of a righteous Man, of a Diſciple without, Signs: What an abſurd Goſpel is this of *W. P*'s? Did God govern by this Law which *W. P.* hath made for him, he would deſtroy Mankind from off the Face of the Earth; but who would expect better from the Goſpel of the Light within, which makes God to be that Light within, which is really nothing. Chriſt's laſt ſtanding Commiſſion is to preach the Goſpel, and baptize, if preaching be eſtabliſhed a Goſpel Duty thereby, which is nothing elſe but *Signs given in God's Name*; how can Water-Baptiſm be excluded out of the Commiſſion for being a Sign.

Mat 28. 18.

But

But *W. P.* argues that Christ the Substance being come, supersedes the Use of Signs: This only proves, that prenunciative Signs, signifying that Christ was to come hereafter, must not as such be used, because such a Signification implies that Christ is not yet come in the Flesh, which is indeed a Doctrine of Antichrist. But Baptism and the Lord's Supper being commemorative Signs, signifie that Christ is come already; and therefore the Substance being come, makes room for the Use of these Signs. It must be confess'd, according to the Tenour of the Gospel of the Light within, Christ's Incarnation it self will signifie nothing: But in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it signifies very much, and therefore it is a great Sign of no less Importance to the Life of the World, than the forming of our first Parents was to the whole Race of Mankind. So likewise in the Quakers Religion, Christ's Death, Resurrection, and Intercession at God's right hand, have no Place assigned for their Use, but stand by as insignificant things; yea, as deforming Appendages that spoil the Symmetry of their Structure; but in the Christian Religion they signifie as much to Immortality, as the dying of the Corn sown, and rooting in the Earth, signifies to the Crop at Harvest.

P. 24.

1 Joh. 4.3.

1 Cor. 15. 45, 49.

Joh. 12.24.

veſt. If theſe things be ſuperfluous in their Scheme, no wonder if the Sacraments be thought needleſs in their Religion; for without Chriſt's Death, Reſurrection, and Incarnation, the Sacraments are inſignificant things in the Judgment of all.

P. 24. *W. P.* ſays, *The Goſpel is inward, ſpiritual, and eternal:* And I ſay, without many Figures, this is not Senſe, and with them it is either not true, or not to the Purpoſe. The Goſpel being the new Covenant, is neither inward, nor outward, but betwixt two. What means he by an inward Bargain? Will this Man never be old enough to leave talking about the inſide and outſide of ſuch things as have no ſides? The Goſpel is ſpiritual, but it is to regulate a Spirit acting a Body in corporeal Motions. This Law of the Spirit juſtifies Men, body and ſoul, that feed, cloath, and viſit neceſſitous Men, and damns Body as well as Soul to Hell, that do not: And theſe are all bodily Works, and cannot be done without Signs. S. *Mark* and St. *Paul* telling us of *the beginning of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*, do half ſpoil his Conceit of the Goſpel's Eternity: We know the Goſpel is an everlaſting Covenant, but we are conſidering its Uſe in this Life (when we ſpeak of Goſpel Sacraments) and that Uſe laſts but to the End of the World.

Mark 1. 1. Phil. 4. 15.

3ly.

3ly. He objects, *Water Baptiſm* (ſo he abſurdly calls it) *was* John's, *not Chriſt's Baptiſm*: The outward Sign, and the inward Grace make both one Chriſtian Baptiſm. The outward part was adminiſtred by *John*, and the inward Grace by Chriſt. For, when *John* baptized Men with Water, Chriſt at the ſame Moment (and not *John*) admitted them, by his Grace, into the Kingdom of Heaven. Wherefore, each of them having his Intereſt and Share in this one Baptiſm, it muſt be affirmed to be the Baptiſm of both, but may o t be denied to be eithers. As the ſame Goſpel is ſaid to be *Paul*'s and Chriſt's. P. 24. Mat. 21. 31, 32. Luke 7. 29, 30.

This is congruous to the ſeveral Offices which Jeſus and *John* had in *erecting* the Kingdom of Heaven. *John* prepared the Rudiments and Materials; Jeſus, by his Power, gave them their Chriſtian Form; *John* was firſt (as it were) to form the material part, and Lineaments of the *Embryo* in Baptiſm. But Chriſt, inſpired it with the Spirit of Life, yielding to it the inward ſpiritual Grace.

4ly. *W. P.* ſays, Jeſus never uſed Water Baptiſm. Now this is very ſtrange, when we know, at his own Inſtance he was moſt ſolemnly baptized in *Jordan*. But though *W. P.* ſays ſo, he does not mean ſo, but only that though Jeſus him- P. 24.

Mat. 3.16. ſelf was baptized with Water, yet he baptized not others. Then ſay I to the Quaker, go thou, and do likewiſe. For I am not perſwading them to be Baptiſts, but to be baptized with Water.

But according to the true Rule of judging in ſuch things, it is certain Jeſus baptized with Water, and that many more than *John* did. For thus we read: *After theſe things came Jeſus and his Diſciples into* Judea, *and he tarried there with them, and he baptized. The ſame* (Jeſus, ſaid *John*'s Diſciples) *baptizeth, and all Men come to him.* Now, ſince it was this great Reſort to Jeſus, for Baptiſm by Water, that gave *John* occaſion to tell his Diſciples of Jeſus increaſing, and his own decreaſing, it's plain, *John* meant Jeſus his out-doing him (as he had formerly declared) amongſt other things, was (not laying aſide Water Baptiſm, but) receiving infinitely more into the Kingdom of Heaven, by baptizing them with Water, than *John* did: For it ſeems, *John* had but few to baptize in Compariſon of Jeſus. When therefore the Evangeliſt takes notice, that *the Phariſes had heard, that Jeſus made, and baptized more Diſciples than* John, and to prevent an Objection that might ariſe in the Readers Mind, from the great Labour and Difficulty of baptizing ſuch

Joh. 3.22, 26.

Joh. 4.1,2.

Num-

Numbers (*when all Men came to him*) he does tell us, that *Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples.* He does not hereby intend to unsay what he had said before: And if so, Jesus did baptize, but it was by the Hand of his Disciples upon his Orders. For had Jesus neither done it with his own Hand, nor appointed and commanded his Disciples to do it, he could not in any Sense, natural, moral, or political, have been said to have baptized, as the Evangelist three times before expressly affirms he did. Now Jesus ordering the Disciples to do it, *becomes* the Author thereby. And this is more significative of a Constitution, when he ordains his Ministers to baptize with Water, than if he had done it by his own Hand.

Can any Man believe, when Jesus made and baptized Disciples, that he made Men Disciples to *John*, and not to himself? Or making them his own Disciples, he used *John*'s, and not his own Baptism in the doing of it? He baptized not by *John*'s Commission, but by his own Power and Authority, and yet, though it was not *John*'s Baptism, it is certain, he baptized with Water: And the Disciples that administred it, did it not in *John*'s Name, but in their own Master's, and by his Command, and not in Vertue of

John's

John's Commiſſion: For then they had been *John*'s, and not Jeſus his Diſciples, as the Text expreſly ſays they were; which is enough to ſhew, that Water-Baptiſm is Jeſus his Baptiſm.

P. 24. 5. Laſtly, ſays *W. P. Water-Baptiſm was no Part of Paul's Commiſſion. Anſw.* Since it has appeared, that it was Part
Mat. 28. 18. of *Peter*'s Commiſſion, which Chriſt gave him and his Collegues before his Aſcenſion, to laſt to the End of the World, it is not to be imagined, that the other Apoſtles made afterward, as *Matthias*, and *Paul*, were without *it*; eſpecially ſince we find, that it was *Paul*'s Cuſtom to baptize his Converts with Water; and even
1 Cor. 1. 15. at *Corinth*, he baptized *Criſpus*, *Stephanus*, and *Gaius*, with ſeveral of their Houſholds, and perhaps others. Now he being an Embaſſador of Chriſt's, how can we believe, he made it *his* common Practice to go beyond his Maſter's Inſtructions, when he always did it in his Maſter's Name? Unleſs plain Neceſſity compels us to believe he abuſed his Maſter's Name in a Manner unallowable in an Embaſſador. But does not St. *Paul*
1 Cor. 1. 17. ſay, Chriſt *ſent him not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel:* He ſays ſo indeed, but I had thought every one, that underſtands the Reaſon of Speech, had underſtood this Saying as I do; and then it's nothing

to

to *W. P*
Speech is
Thoughts
to attend
Speaker a
cerned ſho
ſis is ſo u
verſations
whenever
ence in tal
ſo St. *Pau*
baptize, b
him nothi
preach
not Sacrifi
ſelves, no
with the C
the Hearer
be juſtified
that ſent m
Man, &c
elites wer
men muſt
did) the *J*
ned. Chr
diſowned
Evidence
Chriſt ſe
himſelf ſa
not Specu
formity
Will of

10

to *W. P.*'s Purpose. This Form of Speech is an Elegancy, to call off the Thoughts of the Hearers from one thing, to attend solely to another; which the Speaker at that time was wholly concerned should be observed: Which Ellipsis is so usual in all Writings and Conversations, that we readily understand it, whenever there is the least Inconvenience in taking the Speech otherwise. And so St. *Paul* saying, Christ sent me, not to baptize, but preach, signifies Christ sent him nothing so much to baptize, as to preach. Thus, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice.* Let the *Women adorn themselves, not with putting on of Apparel, but with the Ornament of a quiet Spirit; not the Hearers, but the Doers of the Law shall be justified. My Word is not mine, but his that sent me. I receive not Testimony from Man,* &c. These Places prove, the *Israelites* were not to sacrifice to God, Women must go naked (as some Quakers did) the *Jewish Synagogues* were all damned, Christ taught Contradictions, and disowned *John*'s Record, with the same Evidence that *Paul*'s Words teach, that Christ sent not him to baptize. *W. P.* himself says (Key p. 7.) Not Opinion, not Speculation, not Notions, but Conformity of Mind and Practice to the Will of God, makes a Christian. Does

Hos. 6. 6. 1 Pet. 3. 34. Rom. 2. 13. Joh. 7. 16. c. 5. 34.

W. P.

W. P. here meanᶜ there may be a Chriſtian, that neither thinks there is a God, a Devil, a Heaven, a Hell, or any Difference betwixt Vertue and Vice? For no Man can think any of theſe things to be, that has no Apprehenſions, no Notions, no Opinions. I believe not, *W. P.* intended any ſuch Abſurdity, but meant honeſtly, that Notions and Opinions of things, are nothing ſo conſiderable in Compariſon of conforming our Hearts and Lives to God's Will. And by the ſame Proportion, I underſtand, that *Paul* means the Peculiarity of his Province, as Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, did nothing ſo much conſiſt in Baptiſms, as in preaching the Goſpel: For others might be fitted for that, as well as himſelf; but perhaps no one was ſo well qualified to bear Chriſt's Name amongſt the *Gentiles*, as he who was a choſen Inſtrument. It is to be obſerved therefore, St. *Paul* is not diſcourſing of the Apoſtolical Office as in common to him and other Apoſtles, but of the peculiar Condition of his own Miniſtry, as diſtinct from *Apollos*, *Cephas*, and others in Allegory.

1 Cor. 1. 13, &c.

The ſame in Subſtance may be ſaid of the Lord's Supper. Chriſt celebrates it with his Diſciples, ſignifying, that his meaning was, they ſhould perform this Service at other times, after his Death,

Luke 22. 19.

by

by commanding them *to do it in Remembrance of him*, and for keeping his Death in Remembrance, which is a full Institution of this Service. After his Ascension, he delivers the same to St. *Paul's* Charge, *Paul* delivers the same from the Lord to the Church, and adds sundry particular Ordinances for the right Performance, taking notice, that the *Corinthians* had not *celebrated* it with a due Regard to the Lord's Body therein. And reserving further Orders to be given them upon his next Opportunity, that so they might come together for the better, and be edified by frequenting this Service. Against this, *W.P.* can object nothing, only observes, that this was to be *done only until Christ come*. And we say, that Christ is yet to come, and will be so to the End of the World. And there is no reason in the Condition of any other coming of Christs, which superseds the Use of the Lord's Supper, but only in this coming, when he shall receive us to be where he is, and behold his Glory. This is the great celebrated coming of Christ amongst all Christians, and none other. The Commands then for Baptism and the Lord's Supper, do both expire together at Christ's coming, and at the end of the World, and then both the Reason of the thing, and the

1 Cor. 11. 24, 25. 23. 26.

Ex-

Expreſſions of the Laws do fix the Period of both their Duration. *W. P.* makes the coming of Chriſt here intended, to
P. 25, 26. be *when Chriſt is known to be the Subſtance of the Soul, and the Bread of Life, and the Hope of Glory.* But this was known by the whole Body of true Believers for ſome time before the Sacrament was appointed, or the Orders for its Celebration. Had this been the coming, which Chriſt intended, the Time for the Expiration of the Orders given for the *Euchariſt*, had been before they were made by Chriſt and his Apoſtle. It is manifeſt, none but Believers can eat and drink in that manner as Chriſt and St. *Paul* command: So that they require not Men in Unbelief to partake of that Bread and Cup. If they require not Believers neither, who have Chriſt in them, the Hope of Glory (as *W. P.* ſays they do not) then Chriſt and St. *Paul* give Orders with dreadful Sanctions, and yet will not, that any ſhould obſerve or uſe them. Now this is to mock, and not inſtruct us, and to expoſe the Orders of Chriſt and his Apoſtles to Contempt, and not to expound them, as if he was in earneſt. *W. P.*
Judg 9. 13. *ſpeaks of the new Wine:* Now Wine is an Emblem of *Joy in the Heart of God and Man:* But being this Wine is ſaid to be
Mat. 26. 24. drunk, not in Chriſt's own, *but in his Father's*

Father's Kingdom, therefore this Wine denotes the Joys of Heaven, to be drank by us with Christ; when *he shall have delivered up the Kingdom unto God, even his Father*; at the *End* of the World. Which overthrows *W. P.* his Notion of Christ's coming. *W. P.* talks somewhat of *the Inwardness of this Wine*, but very mystically, grounding himself upon the *Kingdoms being within*, which he would prove from St. *Luke* 17. 20. where our Saviour tells the *Pharisees*, *the Kingdom of God is within them*, meaning, *them*, as a Multitude, which signifie no more than that the Kingdom of God was amongst them, not within any one of them. For, first, the Greek Testament, I think, knows no other way of saying *amongst* but (ἐν) as here, ἐν ὑμῖν. 2ly, The Kingdom of God is an Expression taken from the saying in *Daniel. In those Days, shall the God of Heaven set up a Kingdom*, which is the Kingdom of the Messias. Now this Kingdom (as all Kingdoms do) consists of the King, the Subjects, and the Bond of political Union. But certain it is, that Christ the King, and his Disciples the Subjects, and the Gospel the uniting Covenant, were all in *Judea* amongst the *Pharisees* of that age. Whatever therefore was the Sense of St. *Luke* here, 'tis certain, the Kingdom of the Messias was then amongst the *Pharisees*.

1 Cor. 15. 24.

Dan. 2. 44.

But

But within the *Phariſees*, inſtead of the Meſſias the King, there was a *Samaritan*, a *Deceiver*, a *Belzebub*. Inſtead of the Subjects, an ignorant People, accurſed of God. And inſtead of the uniting Bond of the Kingdom, a Combination of Blaſphemy. So that 'tis evident, the Kingdom of God was then amongſt the *Phariſees*, and the Kingdom of the Devil was within them. If then the Wine *W. P.* ſpeaks of, be of the growth of this Kingdom which was within the *Phariſees*, 'tis *not the Cup of the Lord, but the Cup of Devils*. Such are their infallible teachings, which they have by Divinations from their Light within. For, upon that Miſtake of this Text, the moſt part of their Quakeriſm is built. In a word, Chriſt (*we ſee*) eſtabliſhed the Sacraments in his Kingdom: The Apoſtles adminiſtred them, the Catholick Church hath practiſed accordingly throughout all ſucceeding Ages, only ſome ignorant Peo-
*Key p. 26. ple, out of ſome weak Fancies, * *now leave them off*, and *W. P.* undertakes to defend them in it, but with ſuch Allegations as I ſhould have thought, no Man, if he had a Mind, would have had the face to offer againſt the common ſenſe of all Chriſtians.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

FINIS.

of the
naritan,
he Sub-
of God.
of the
phemy.
of God
and the
n them:
e of the
s with-
be Lord,
ir infal-
by Di-
n. For,
ne moſt
a word,
aments
admini-
ch hath
all ſuc-
nt Peo-
* *now*
akes to
Allega-
o Man,
he face
e of all